

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 3, 4, 6-7, 10-12, and 18 stands objected to because of informalities.

Claims 6, 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-6, 9, 14-17 and 19 stand rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,042,266 to Cheslock et al.

Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,906,437 to Cheslock in view of Lin.

Claims 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,775,586 to Cheslock in view of Bohrn et al.

Claims 7-8 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 3-7, 12, 14, 15 and 17 have been amended to describe the invention differently. Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-10 and 11-19 are presently pending.

**The Claims Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter**

Claims 3, 4, 6-7, 10-12, and 18 stands objected to because of informalities. By way of the foregoing amendments, claims 3, 4, 6-7, 10-12 and 18 have been amended to address these informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments have addressed these rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 6 and 14-16 be withdrawn.

**All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

Claims 1-6, 9, 14-17 and 19 stands rejected to under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,042,266 to Cheslock et al. Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,906,437 to Cheslock in view of Lin. Claims 13 and 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,775,586 to Cheslock in view of Bohrn et al.

All of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections are primarily based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,042,266 to Cheslock et al. Applicants respectfully submit that Cheslock et al. is not prior art to

the present application in accordance with the decision of Interference No. 104,708 (paper No. 15 in parent application 09/117,724). More particularly, the decision of Interference No. 104,708 rendered the judgement that parent application 09/117,724 is senior to Cheslock et al. Applicants respectfully assert that the present application has the benefits of priority from the parent application 09/117,724. Thus, the present application is also senior to Cheslock et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections are improper since they are not based upon prior art to the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:

  
Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Reg. No. 47,256

Dated: June 2, 2004

Customer No.: 009629

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-7000  
Facsimile: 202-739-3001